

August, 1958



THE NATIONAL *Voter*

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U. S.

1026 17th STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.



FROM THE

**PRESIDENT'S
DESK**

A little less than two years ago, as the world faced the crisis at Suez, League members were asking themselves: "What can we do?" Well, you know what we did. All over the United States, Leagues put aside regular League work for the moment to "focus on the future." Through a genuine community effort, we helped to promote calm discussion of the causes of the trouble at Suez, as well as the requirements of a sound U.S. foreign policy.

Once again the crisis nature of the Middle Eastern situation has brought a crisis reaction on the part of the American people. And, along with other citizens, we too are gravely concerned about what the present situation will mean to the United States and to the world. As League members, we are again wondering: What can the League do?

To me the answer is to keep right on doing what we have set out to do. The immediate crisis can illuminate and add urgency to the things we are already doing; it should not deflect us from the course we have set.

Fortunately, by adopting our foreign policy item at our 1958 national Convention, we were deciding in effect that the thinking we have done and the action we have taken over the years, though making an effective contribution in trade and foreign aid and in support of the United Nations, was not enough — that it was time for a look at U.S. foreign policy as a whole to consider how it could best be geared to a new and changing world.

Faced as we are with a new world crisis, it seems all the more clear to me that the role of the League of Women Voters is not to come up with a quick solution for meeting the crisis of the moment. Rather, the challenge for the League is to work toward developing new perspectives in U. S. foreign policy.

The present crisis, like the crises that preceded it, will not be solved by recriminations or hindsight about what the United States should have done. By taking a long look at the knotty questions involved in our foreign policy, I believe the League can again make a substantial contribution. We can help arouse the

FROM THE DESK
OF THE

LEAGUE'S U.N. OBSERVER



During mid-July people stood in line for hours on end hoping to get into the U.N. Security Council sessions on Lebanon. Their anxiety was reflected in the question, "Is this the start of World War III?" Within the Council chamber the speeches of the delegates reflected the same fear of war. The small powers were trying to put the brakes on actions of the big powers. The big powers were treading softly too because they are fully aware that every action stimulates a counter action. While all want to act, none want to provoke retaliation by nuclear bombs.

The difficulty of uniting the world behind the U.S. decision to send troops to Lebanon resulted from a confused interpretation of the events that had taken place there. The issue which has plagued the United Nations in the past, and will plague it again in the future, was to determine to what extent the revolt was internal, and to what extent it was caused by aggression from outside.

The orthodox type of war, in which troops cross national borders to attack, is easily understood, and the world responds to the challenge. But the more subtle type of conquest by infiltration and nonmilitary attack is difficult to interpret. We have no historical precedents which establish standards for judgment. Each individual, therefore, uses his own measuring scale to weigh events, and, as a result, different conclusions are reached.

For instance, when President Nasser of the United Arab Republic broadcasts a message asking for the death of King Hussein of Jordan, is this aggression? If one nation sends its civilians into another country, who is to determine whether their intentions are to preserve peace or to foster war? Is it aggression if country A gains economic control of country B and then threatens that country with financial ruin unless it obeys the orders of country A?

How to define outside intervention in the domestic affairs of a country and what to do about it will be a major dilemma of the twentieth century.

Clearly, the United States felt it had to respond to Lebanon's request for help, but fear that our intentions

President's Desk (Continued)

American public to its task of understanding the constancy of change in the world we *have* and the persistence required if we are to achieve the world we *want*.

Today Leagues all over the country are making plans for examining U.S. foreign policy—what it is, how well it fits our national objectives, whether it should be changed.

Local and state Board members have been appointed, committees have met, reading assignments have been made, meeting times have been set. Here in the national office, Board and staff members have been drafting materials as well as working out plans for help and guidance to Leagues.

Though the material for our first pamphlet is still in draft form, the major part of it is concerned with U.S. foreign policies toward certain groups of countries including the Western democracies, the newly-developing nations, and the Communist countries. Policies on which the League has taken action are also reviewed in relation to each of these groups of countries.

I cannot resist the temptation to share with you some of the excitement we have been feeling in preparing this pamphlet. Here is a taste of it: "U. S. foreign policy must seek and reflect 'new perspectives' geared

to the emerging world, not the old one. . . .

"Is the role of the United States to be positive or passive in its foreign policy? Is it enough to 'get by'? Is it enough just to react to the gambits of the U.S.S.R. or others? Obviously, the role of world leadership makes it necessary that the United States initiate positive policies to enhance its national interest; that it be creative; that it be, yes, idealistic though realistic. It is equally true, however, that the United States is not clairvoyant; that it cannot always see what's ahead; that in some cases it will have to react, it will have to shift. . . .

"The informed citizen has to be aware of policy alternatives. . . . The citizen must care, know, decide and act. It is not an easy task, but it is . . . the key to democracy's endurance."

Ruth S. Phillips

U.N. Observer (Continued)

will be misunderstood makes us anxious to withdraw our troops as soon as possible. During this crisis the United States placed heavy reliance on the United Nations because we felt that we needed world support to ratify our actions. Also, the United States would be in a less vulnerable position if an international group,

not suspect of partisan motives, assumed control.

Although the U.S. action may have served to stabilize conditions momentarily in the Middle East, the long-term objective of bringing peace to the area is still ahead. The dimensions of the problem are comparable to those we face locally in outbreaks of gang warfare, or in the disturbances occurring in Little Rock last year. With enough police to patrol, law and order can be restored, but the real job of society is to correct the conditions which produced the disorder.

Any long-term solution of the Middle East difficulties must be preceded by an evaluation of our foreign policy objectives with consideration of such factors as: Do we wish to preserve the status quo in the separate Arab countries or urge consolidation among them? Are outside guarantees of military protection a stabilizing or a provocative factor? Will increased economic development promote peace? How important are the oil reserves of the Middle East? Is it possible to reduce tension between Israel and the Arab states? If not, do we have to choose sides? How important is the Middle East in the global East-West conflict?

Zelia P. Ruelhausen

KEEPING UP WITH LEAGUE PROGRAM

(as of August 15)

TRADE: The Trade Agreements Act extension cleared its last legislative hurdle August 11, when the Senate approved the conference report, 72 yeas—16 nays. The House had accepted it August 7. The 4-year extension, a compromise between the 5-year House version and the Senate's 3-year proposal, is the longest granted in the 24-year history of the Act. The President is given authority to negotiate a 20 percent reduction in tariffs over this period. The President is also given authority to increase tariffs up to 50 percent above the rates in effect in 1934 under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

For the first time in the Act's history Congress is given a measure of control over tariff-cutting decisions, for the President may now be overruled by a two-thirds vote of both houses when he does not agree with Tariff Commission recommendations in escape clause

cases. The national security provisions of the Act were broadened to include consideration of the impact of imports on U.S. economic welfare.

The Administration expressed satisfaction with the final form of the extension. Whether it will become a useful tool for expanding world trade depends upon its administration and the way in which the new authority given the President and Congress is used.

MUTUAL SECURITY: The Senate Appropriations Committee increased funds for the Mutual Security Program by \$440 million over the amount voted by the House. Passage of this legislation and resolution of differences between House and Senate versions in conference may well be one of the last things Congress does before adjournment.

The League of Women Voters of the United States on July 18 submitted a statement to the Senate Appropria-

tions Committee in support of funds for economic aid and technical assistance in the Mutual Security Program.

LOYALTY-SECURITY: The conference between the House and Senate on S. 1411 as amended, to extend the federal loyalty-security programs to all government employees, met briefly August 7. Senate conferees insisted that the bill revert to the original form in which it passed the Senate August 8, 1957, when it made suspension of a suspected employee permissive rather than mandatory. House members insisted upon the House version, passed July 10, 1958. No future meeting date has been announced.

D. C. HOME RULE: The Senate on August 6 passed S. 1846, a bill to provide a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia. This is the fourth time that a D.C. home rule bill has won Senate approval. The House has taken no action during this Congress.

Two Ways In, One Way Out

"There is no dichotomy between consideration of national water policies and river basin studies," stated a delegate during program debate at the League's 1958 national Convention. She continued:

"A river basin study cannot help but deal with existing national water policies. A river basin study is a working illustration of the over-all national problem."

Most Leagues started their study of the 1956-58 national Program water item by examining national water policies; a few started with their own river basin. Some Leagues are only now concentrating upon their study of water resources and are questioning which of these two ways to start, now that the national study of water has moved into the 1958-60 wording. As the delegate indicated, the approach matters little; one path is certain to run into the other.

The Delaware River Basin can serve as an appropriate "working illustration," since planning is well under way there.

This basin includes the states of New York, New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania. These states comprise the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin known as Incodel, established in 1936.

Compacts such as Incodel have been in existence for some years in various river basins, and achievements have been made at that level. In late 1955, "planning . . . for the nation as a whole" was recommended by the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy after a year's study. The Committee recommended that "planning for water resources and related developments be conducted on a cooperative basis with representatives of all federal, state and local agencies involved, and that this joint participation be continuous from the beginning in order that plans and projects developed assure the best and most effective use and control of water to meet both the current and long-range needs of the people of a region, state, or locality, and of the nation as a whole."

Following a hurricane and de-

structive floods in the East in 1955, Congress authorized a 3-year \$1.75 million study of the Delaware Basin to be made by the Army Corps of Engineers, with the Philadelphia District Engineer in charge; the study was started in 1956.

In the same year, 1956, the President directed the formation of a Coordinating Committee for the Delaware; also, the governors of the four basin states and the mayors of New York City and Philadelphia set up the Delaware River Basin Advisory Committee.

The President's Coordinating Committee held its first meeting in April 1957. Its purpose is to review progress and advise the District Engineer. It is composed of representatives of the four basin states and the two major cities mentioned above, plus representatives from each of the federal departments involved.

Many Agencies Studying

And how many federal agencies are involved?

The Department of Agriculture is to determine the present land-use patterns for areas outside urban limits; the Soil Conservation and Forest Services are compiling the data. An inventory of urban development is being made by the Bureau of the Census. Data from the Geological Survey is being used to compile an inventory of the basin's water resources. The Fish and Wildlife Service is inventorying the fish and wildlife population of the region. The National Park Service is assembling data on public and private recreational resources. The Public Health Service is inventorying the present requirements for vector (an organism, usually an insect, which carries and transmits disease-causing microorganisms) control and bringing up to date past studies of stream pollution loads. The Federal Power Commission will determine the value of the hydroelectric power potential and project water requirements of future power installations. The Atomic Energy Commission will furnish its views on future water demands for nuclear industry. The Army Engineer Corps is studying flood problems.

In all, 19 agencies at the federal level alone are involved in the study of the Delaware River Basin, and the over-all total, including state and local agencies, is approximately 100.

The Corps of Engineers is responsible for initiating coordination. All state agencies are requested to permit consolidation of their papers by the federal counterpart to the greatest extent possible. The consolidated studies will be submitted to the Corps' offices for reproduction and mailed to all concerned for review. If divergent views appear, the District Engineer will appoint an *ad hoc* committee to iron out the difficulties.

The Delaware River Basin Advisory Committee, under a private grant, is supervising a study of governmental structure in order to make recommendations as to possible future development of a basin operating agency able and competent to carry out the plan which the Corps and others are working on.

Coordination Is Key

There are numerous Acts of Congress, Executive Orders and inter-agency agreements calling for the Corps to coordinate its planning with other federal agencies and with state and local interests. However, there is no statutory mandate on the books to assure coordination, and, for the most part, water development must depend upon statutes passed at different times for different functions and administered by different agencies.

Meanwhile, the need for comprehensive development and coordination increases, especially in view of the fact that population is rising and industry is expanding.

Coordinated planning for the development and use of water resources will not come about without a great deal of work by a great many people. But whether you look at a chart of federal agencies and see their overlapping and duplication, or whether you view these agencies as they pursue their assigned functions within a river basin, the need for coordination will clearly emerge.

As the delegate said, there is no dichotomy.

Meet The Men Who

Between now and Election Day 1958, voters will be trying to decide which candidate for a given office they choose to vote for. The final choice will be made, in most cases between candidates of the two major parties, on November 4 in all states except Maine, which for the last time will be holding its general election in September. In most states, primaries have been held and choices for party candidates have already been made; in 15 states, choices for party candidates are yet to be made, in September primaries.

The League's Role

One of the most effective forces in helping the voter to make his various choices in the general election or in the remaining primaries will be the League of Women Voters. The "candidates meeting" is, perhaps, still the hallmark of the League in most communities; in many communities, the League is the only organization which sponsors nonpartisan public meetings in which all candidates for a given office are given equal opportunity to explain their views to voters.

Testimony to the public service rendered by a League candidates meeting is the following excerpt from a newspaper story:

"Your first—and probably only—chance to catch all six candidates for U. S. Senator on the same platform comes tomorrow night at the Ambassador. The League of Women Voters, which takes a continuing interest in politics but never endorses candidates, accomplished the neat trick of getting all the candidates together at the same time and getting all of them to submit to questioning in public."

This was the lead of a story by the political editor of the *Los Angeles Mirror News* in late May 1958, five days before the June primary election.

The meeting was held at a banquet during the League's state convention. Planning was started in the fall of 1957, with "missionary work" among radio and television personnel, and invitations to the candidates as soon as they declared instead of waiting for the official list. By January the meeting was in the specific planning stage.

As soon as the League announced that all six candidates—four Republicans, one Democrat, one Socialist—would appear on the same platform, things began to happen fast: 12 days before the meeting a local network radio station committed itself to carry one hour live; 11 days before, a second network station agreed to tape the meeting for a one-hour state-wide rebroadcast; 10 days before, a local TV station agreed to carry one hour live. When these listings were made public, radio and TV columns began to print articles, as did *Variety*, political editors took note, and reservations for the banquet took a jump. By the night of the meeting, the wire services, news and political reporters, editors of papers in surrounding communities, two TV news cameras, a national newsreel and *Look* magazine were there and attendance had grown to 550.

Questions and Answers

The question put to each candidate was: "What is the most vital issue facing the United States Senate today?" Each candidate was allowed four minutes to answer. The time was carefully watched, to the satisfaction of candidates, radio and television stations—and "equal time" regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. Opening remarks and brief introduction of each candidate by the moderator, the state president of the League, built up this segment of the program to 30 minutes. (Instead of taking air time for lengthy introductions, copies of the state publication giving answers of all candidates for state-wide office to a League candidates questionnaire were distributed as people left the meeting.)

The next half hour was devoted to questions from the audience, on domestic and foreign affairs subjects. Each question was directed to a specific candidate, who was given two minutes for his reply.

Members and guests were seated in small groups at the banquet, and at each table a local League president presided, identified by a "diplomatic type" ribbon bearing the name of her League. At each table were cards and pencils for use in writing questions.

Plenty of Questions

Local League presidents had come to convention primed with questions from their local membership—and there are 56 local Leagues in California. A special briefing session was held to eliminate duplication and insure diversification of questions. All questions were channeled through and put to the candidates by the local League presidents. Since the meeting was a Voters Service activity, questions could be on any issue of public interest and were not limited to League program.

In this question-and-answer period "equal time" was, again, meticulously observed. Whenever the questions seemed to go too often to one candidate, the moderator would ask if any microphone had a question for another candidate. Otherwise, the "mikes" were taken in numerical order.

The California League wrote:

"Fortunately for the newspapers, though not necessarily a matter of great voter edification, one innocent-sounding question prompted a hassle between major contenders which was highlighted by picture and press coverage throughout the state the next day. . . .

"The many letters and phone calls which came to the League office after the meeting, the complimentary remarks from the radio and television people (with a 'we really must do this more often' tinge), and the warm and genuinely appreciative letters from all of the candidates as well as several of their party committeemen, would indicate that the meeting served a genuine public service.

"And one reporter said: 'Only the League of Women Voters would put on a show like this'."

THE NATIONAL VOTER

Vol. VIII August, 1958 No. 5

Published monthly by the League of Women Voters of the United States.
1026 17th Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

MRS. ROBERT J. PHILLIPS, President
DOROTHY FELKER GINTON, Editor

Entered as second class matter, April 9, 1951, at the Post Office, Washington, D. C., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Subscriptions: \$1.00 a year in United States and U. S. territories and possessions, Canada, Mexico;
all other countries, \$1.50 a year.

Single copy: 10 cents.
(Quantity prices on request.)